



## **Key Steps in Addressing AI Policies in your Classroom**

- (1) Provide clear AI-use guidelines in your syllabi or assignment descriptions.
- (2) Each semester, review the wording of your syllabus and assignments to see if the AI-related language needs updating. It is important to keep your directions clear and up to date to clarify what constitutes an academic integrity violation in your class.
- (3) We recommend including the Student Honor Code in your syllabus. Please ensure that all students review it carefully and sign to acknowledge their full understanding.

As a student at Saginaw Valley State University:

I am committed to upholding a high standard of academic integrity in all of my work, inside and outside of the classroom. Out of respect for my peers, professors, institution, and self, I will complete all tasks honestly and to the best of my ability.

I am guided by my conscience as I work toward my educational and professional goals, and I expect my fellow students to practice that same moral judgment.

I take pride in my academic accomplishments and therefore will not give or receive unauthorized assistance on any assignment, project, exam, or other university requirement.

I seek to maintain the honor of a Saginaw Valley State University degree, and I will preserve its value throughout my professional career.

# FAQ: Addressing Suspected AI Violations of Academic Integrity

## 1. What should I do if I suspect a student has used AI in violation of my course policies?

Your first step is to **review the evidence carefully** to ensure there is sufficient reason to believe academic dishonesty may have occurred. You are encouraged to consult with your **department chair, academic dean, or the Office of Student Conduct Programs** to discuss the situation and determine an appropriate course of action.

## 2. What kind of evidence is appropriate to gather in suspected AI cases?

Faculty should use **multiple forms of evidence** to support a well-founded concern. Useful documentation may include:

- Assignment drafts showing **sudden or unusual shifts in voice, tone, or style**;
- **Metadata** or revision history from Canvas, Google Docs, or Microsoft Word;
- **Turnitin's AI detection reports** (with caution—see below);
- Screenshots of submission timestamps or version logs;
- Records of prior student work showing inconsistencies; and
- The student's **inability to explain or reproduce their work** when questioned

## 3. Can I rely on AI detection tools like Turnitin?

**No, not solely.** AI detection tools are **not definitive** and should **not be used as standalone evidence** for an academic dishonesty charge. These tools provide estimates and are prone to both false positives and false negatives. Use them only as **part of a broader investigation**, ideally supported by drafts, revision history, or a student interview. This is also true of using Turnitin for plagiarism.

Examples of AI detection tools are GPTZero, Originality.AI, Copyleaks AI Content Detector, and Writer.com AI Detector. **Faculty should use *only* Turnitin for AI detection because uploading a student's assignment into other platforms could be viewed as a violation of FERPA.**

**AI tools like ChatGPT or Gemini CANNOT identify AI-generated material, even if they claim to be able to do so.**

#### 4. What if my course doesn't clearly state expectations around AI use?

Before proceeding with a formal charge, verify that your **AI expectations were communicated clearly and in writing** (e.g., in the syllabus or assignment instructions). If your policy was ambiguous, a formal charge may be difficult to uphold, and a **teachable moment** may be more appropriate than a disciplinary one. Consider updates for next semester.

#### 5. How should I talk to a student if I suspect unauthorized AI use?

You may ask the student to:

- **Explain how they completed the work;**
- **Demonstrate their drafting process;** and
- **Clarify their understanding** of the material.

Conversations should be respectful and focus on **fact-finding**, not confrontation. Many cases can be resolved or clarified through discussions.

The Office of Student Conduct Programs has provided email templates for contacting students about suspected academic integrity violations.

#### 6. What challenges might I face in bringing a charge?

AI-related academic integrity cases present unique complexities. Faculty may encounter difficulties in substantiating violations, particularly when:

- **Over-reliance on AI detection tools**  
Tools like Turnitin's AI detection report or GPTZero provide probabilistic judgments, not certainties. These tools can flag original student work as AI-generated or miss AI-generated text entirely. Because detection scores lack transparency and are not evidence-based in a legal or procedural sense, using them as the primary basis for a charge is risky and may not hold up under scrutiny. Faculty should always combine tool results with other forms of evidence.
- **Ambiguity in course expectations**  
If your syllabus or assignment directions do not clearly specify whether, when, or how AI tools may be used, students may reasonably claim they did not know their actions were impermissible. Without explicit guidelines, the line between acceptable tool use (e.g., Grammarly) and academic dishonesty (e.g., using

ChatGPT to write a paper) becomes blurred. This weakens the foundation for formal charges.

- **Subjective interpretation of writing style**

Faculty may suspect AI use based on sudden improvements in grammar, tone, or vocabulary, or a shift in a student's typical voice. However, these observations are inherently subjective and can be influenced by unconscious bias or unacknowledged factors (e.g., help from a tutor, improved effort, or use of spell-check). Without supporting evidence, relying on a "gut feeling" about style may be insufficient.

- **Student awareness of AI-assisted tools like Grammarly or Quillbot, which may fall in gray areas**

Many students use digital writing aids without realizing they may violate academic integrity policies—especially if such tools are widely marketed as learning supports. For example, Grammarly and Quillbot may suggest rewrites or paraphrases that go well beyond simple grammar fixes. If your policy does not clarify whether these tools are acceptable, it becomes difficult to argue that the student knowingly engaged in misconduct.

## 7. What are best practices for handling suspected AI violations?

- **Document everything:** Save drafts, detection reports, and communication.
- **Avoid assumptions:** Do not treat AI use as self-evident based on "voice" alone.
- **Use student interviews** to clarify intent and method.
- **Involve colleagues or the Office of Student Conduct** early in ambiguous or contested cases.
- **Ensure fairness:** Use the same evaluative criteria for all students and avoid selective enforcement.

## 8. How can I prevent these issues in the future?

- **Set clear expectations** for AI use in your syllabus and assignments.
- Use **process-based assignments** (e.g., drafts, reflections, writing logs).
- Consider asking students to **reflect on or cite their use of AI tools** when permitted.
- Stay informed about **current AI tools and their educational uses**.
- Consult CETL's [AI Guide](#) and use its "stress test" to identify where your course is currently vulnerable to unauthorized AI use and how you might address those

vulnerabilities. Individual consultations with CETL's instructional designer are also available.

For additional support or to discuss a potential case, contact the **Office of Student Conduct Programs**.

## **9. Where can I find models of an AI Policy statement for my syllabus?**

- CETL has examples of AI policies on its [AI Guide](#).
- A Google search tailored to your course or discipline will turn up many examples that you could adapt.